IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant

Bimbrich et al. 09/782,366

Appl. No. Filed

02/13/01

Title

HYDROPHILIC ADDITIVE

Grp./A.U. :

1771

Examiner :

L. Salvatoro

Docket No. : C 2220 US

<u>, aneloz</u> I have try and for that this paper is believe from the transmission to the Delice transmission

Vrasimgen, UCzuzul

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION PEONIPEMENT

This process is in response to the contract of the contract of en la companya de la La companya de la co

The Examiner has missed that the second of t Examiner has indicated that the location of Coop 1. (d.m. 1.17, for the coop 1.17) and the coop is the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the coop in the coop in the coop is the coop in the increasing the hydrophilicity of a polymer, classified in Class 525, subclass 7%. The invention of Group II, claims 20-31 is said to be directed to a non-woven fabric, classified in Class 442, subclass 414.

The inventions are said to be distinct, each from the other because the intermediate polymer product is deemed to be useful as an extruded film and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

6102784971

Appl. No.: 09/782,366

Grp. A.U.: 1771

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's above-noted contentions and submits that no clear reason appears in the record to justify grouping claims (1-19) in Group I and claims (20-31) in Group II. More particularly, the Examiner contends that the inventions are different because: (1) the intermediate polymer product as claimed can be useful as an extruded film, and (2) there is nothing on the record to show that to be obvious variants.

to snow that the inventions of the Exercise of

Secondly, with respect to the element of distinctness, the Examiner has not even offered an opinion as to why the four element of distinctness, the Examiner has not even offered an opinion as to why the four element of distinctness, the Examiner has not even offered an opinion as to why the four element of distinctness, the Examiner has not even offered an opinion as to why the four element of distinctness, the Examiner has not even offered an opinion as to why the four element of distinctness.

k, and a second of the second

considered together. The fact that the claims of all 1 and groups may be disconsidered together. The fact that the claims of all 1 and groups may be disconsidered together. The fact that the claims of all 1 and groups may be disconsidered to a single group would not appreciably shorten the necessarily to distinguish economic inventions. It would appear that a complete search of the claims would require a search of all the classes and subclasses identified by the Examiner. Thus, restriction of the application to a single group would not appreciably shorten the necessary search.

Appl. No.:

09/782,366

Grp. A.U.:

1771

The requirement is thus respectfully traversed and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof is requested. However, in order to comply with the requirement of Rule 142, Applicant is provisionally elasting the invention of Croup I, alains 1-49, with traverse, for further examination on the medits.

Respectfully submitted,

ant to

\$0 mm = 0.5 0.000 mm.